



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/781,983

02/18/2004

Jon Matousek

MSFT122014

5394

26389

7590

12/12/2007

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC

1420 FIFTH AVENUE

SUITE 2800

SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CINDY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2161

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/12/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/781,983

Applicant(s)

MATOUSEK JON

Examiner

Cindy Nguyen

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/27/07 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10, 13-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winner et al. (US 6272074) (hereafter Winner) in view of Furukawa et al. (US 6594637, hereafter Furukawa).

Regarding claims 1 and 13, Winner discloses: A computer-implemented method of filtering recurrence events (i.e., repetitive calendar event are stored as single entries in the present invention using an expression language, col. 3, lines 23-36, Winner) and a computer-

readable medium bearing computer-executable instructions which, when executed, carry out a method of filtering recurrence events comprising:

in response to receiving a request to display a recurrence event in a computing device (i.e., an event request is submitted to the database so that the scheduler process can complete the request, col. 4, lines 33-44), determining if a filter for identifying items that match a search criteria defined by the user is required to satisfy said request (i.e., the scheduler process obtains the data, compares the calendar data, and sets an event in the calendars of the attendees when an appropriate event period is determine, col. 4, lines 40-44), wherein said recurrence event is represented in a database in a single database record (i.e., an event is stored as a collection of information in a storage means, an event is a record or table of fields, col. 4, lines 45-54, Winner).

However, Winner is silent to disclose: if a filter is required to satisfy said request and not satisfy said request. On the other hand, Furukawa discloses: if a filter is required to satisfy said request, creating a data set that is stored in the memory of the computing device related to said recurrence event consisting of filtered items and exceptions (i.e., inputting a routine condition such as every day, every other day... and an exceptional condition such as "a holiday is not registered and a "a registration on a holiday is shifted up to the previous day" can be set up as routine condition for possible to set up a schedule"... see col. 10, lines 41 to col. 11, lines 20, Furukawa); and

structuring said data set of filtered items and exceptions for display on the computing device, wherein structuring said data set includes expanding said recurrence event from the single database record (i.e., the routine schedule data generating part 112 of obtains information

of holidays related to the output of the routine schedule from the holiday management table using information of the routine period 217 and routine condition 219 and calculates the date on which the routine schedule is outputted...see col. 10, lines 51-57, Furukawa);

conversely, if a filter is not required to satisfy said request; creating a data set that is stored in the memory of the computing device related to said recurrence event consisting of filtered items, recurrence events, and exceptions (i.e., inputting a routine condition such as every day, every other day... and an exceptional condition such as "a holiday is not registered and a "a registration on a holiday is shifted up to the previous day" can be set up as routine condition for possible to set up a schedule"... see col. 10, lines 41 to col. 11, lines 20, Furukawa) ; and

structuring said data set of filtered items, recurrent events, and exceptions for display on the computing device, wherein structuring said data set includes expanding said recurrence event from the single database record (i.e., the routine schedule data generating part 112 of obtains information of holidays related to the output of the routine schedule from the holiday management table using information of the routine period 217 and routine condition 219 and calculates the date on which the routine schedule is outputted...see col. 10, lines 51-57, Furukawa).

Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include generating a Hypertext Markup Language document suitable for display by a Web browser program in the system of Winner as taught by Barnett. The motivation being to enable the system to generate an html file which can be passed to the user and read by a browser.

Regarding claims 2 and 14, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 13 above, respectively. In addition, Winner/ Furukawa discloses: wherein the request to display at least one recurrence event is generated by a client-computing device (i.e., the scheduler process to compute the days on which an event occurs, col. 5, lines 30-40, Winner).

Regarding claims 3 and 15, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 13 above, respectively. In addition, Winner/ Furukawa discloses: wherein the request to display at least one recurrence event is received by a server-computing device (col. 4, lines 33-44, Winner).

Regarding claims 4 and 16, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 3 and 15 above, respectively. In addition, Winner/ Furukawa discloses: wherein server-computing device includes the database that supports a Structure Query Language (col. 4, lines 18 –20, Winner).

Regarding claims 5 and 17, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 13 above, respectively. Winner/ Furukawa discloses: disclose: the steps wherein creating a data set that is stored in the memory of the computing device consisting of filtered items and exceptions comprises:

(a) obtaining a data set of exceptions (i.e., recurring event expression including an anti-event, col. 10, lines 1-65, Winner);

(b) obtaining a data set of filtered items, the data set of filtered items including recurrence events and exceptions (i.e., recurring event expression including an anti-event, col. 10, lines 1-65, Winner);

(c) identifying exceptions that are not included in the exceptions included in the data set of filtered items by applying a set operation on the data set of exceptions and the data set of filtered items (i.e., the working day recurrence expressions contain the recurrence expression, but the user's non-working days follow the recurrence expression. This is indicated by a double pound sign (##). , in the table 3, the user's non-working days are Sunday and Saturday indicated by values of 1 and 7 enclosed in parentheses for the day field of the anti-event, col. 10, lines 15-52, Winner); and

(d) adding the exceptions that are not included in the data set of filtered items to the data set of filtered items (col. 10, lines 61-65, Winner).

Regarding claims 6 and 18, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 5 and 17 above, respectively. In addition, Winner/ Furukawa discloses: wherein obtaining a data set of exceptions comprises: generating a database query that requests exceptions (i.e., recurring event expression including an anti-event, col. 10, lines 1-65, Winner);
b) applying said database to a database query (requested the sum schedule (col. 10, lines

66 to col. 11, lines 15, Winner); and in response to said database query, receiving said data set of exceptions (col. 10, lines 66 to col. 11, lines 15, Winner).

Regarding claims 7 and 19, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 5 and 17 above, respectively. In addition, Winner/ Furukawa discloses: wherein obtaining a data set of filtered items comprises: generating a database query that requests recurrence events and exceptions (i.e., recurring event expression including an anti-event, col. 10, lines 1-65, Winner); applying said database query to a database query exceptions (col. 10, lines 66 to col. 11, lines 15, Winner); and in response to said database query, receiving said data set of recurrence events and exceptions (col. 10, lines 66 to col. 11, lines 15, Winner).

Regarding claims 8 and 20, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 4 and 17 above, respectively. In addition, Winner/ Furukawa discloses: wherein identifying exceptions that are not included in the exceptions included in the data set of filtered items comprises performing a computer-implemented set difference operation between: (a) the exceptions; and (b) the data set of filtered items (col. 10, lines 58 to col. 11, lines 18, Winner).

Regarding claims 9 and 21, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 4 and 17 above, respectively. In addition, Winner/ Furukawa discloses: wherein adding the subset of exceptions that are not included in the data set of filtered items to the data set of filtered items comprises performing a computer-implemented set

union operation between: (a) the exceptions; and (b) the data set of filtered items col. 10, lines 58 to col. 11, lines 18, Winner).

Regarding claim 20, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 17 above, respectively. In addition, Winner/ Furukawa discloses: wherein identifying exceptions that are not included in the exceptions included in the data set of filtered items comprises performing a computer-implemented set difference operation between: the exceptions; and the data set of filtered items (table 1 and col. 6, 1, lines 18 to col. 7, lines 17, Winner).

Regarding claim 21, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 17 above, respectively. In addition, Winner/ Furukawa discloses: wherein adding the subset of exceptions that are not included in the data set of filtered items to the data set of filtered items comprises performing a computer-implemented set union operation between: (a) the exceptions; and (b) the data set of filtered items (table 1 and col. 6, 1, lines 18 to col. 7, lines 17, Winner).

Regarding claims 10 and 22, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 13 above, respectively. In addition, Winner/ Furukawa discloses: further comprising rendering said data set of filtered items structured for display on the computing device on the display associated with the computing device (col. 4, lines 23-31 and col. 11, lines 20-38. Winner).

Claims 11, 12, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winner et al. (US 6272074) (hereafter Winner) in view of Furukawa et al. (US 6594637, hereafter Furukawa) and further in view of Barnett et al. (US 6369840) (hereafter Barnett).

Regarding claims 11 and 23, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 10 and 22 above, respectively. However, Winner/ Furukawa didn't disclose: discloses: wherein said rendering comprises generating a Hypertext Markup Language document suitable for display by a Web browser program. On the other hand, Barnett discloses: wherein said rendering comprises generating a Hypertext Markup Language document suitable for display by a Web browser program (col. 18, lines 23-26, Barnett). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include generating a Hypertext Markup Language document suitable for display by a Web browser program in the system of Winner as taught by Barnett. The motivation being to enable the system to generate an html file which can be passed to the user and read by a browser.

Regarding claims 12 and 24, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 11 and 23 above, respectively. In addition, Winner/ Furukawa /Barnett discloses: wherein said Hypertext Markup Language document displays a calendar that contains at least one item (col. 18, lines 53-67, Barnett). Thus, at the time

invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include generating a Hypertext Markup Language document suitable for display by a Web browser program in the system of Winner as taught by Barnett. The motivation being to enable the system to generate an html file which can be passed to the user and read by a browser.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4025. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/781,983
Art Unit: 2161

Page 11

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cindy Nguyen



ETIENNE LEROUX
PRIMARY EXAMINER